DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 816 FL 020 799

TITLE	The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation: A Report to the Congress and the President.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of the Secretary.
REPORT NO	ED/OBEMLA-92-10
PUB DATE	30 Jun 92
NOTE	84p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Education Programs; Demography; Educational Assessment; Educational Objectives; Educational Research; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; *Government Role; Higher Education; Identification; *Limited English Speaking; National Surveys; Public Agencies; *Public Policy; *Student Characteristics; Student Placement; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Bilingual Education Act 1968; *Office of Bilingual Educ Minority Lang Affairs

ABSTRACT

The federally-mandated report on the status of bilingual education in the United States: (1) reports on programmatic, research, and training activities administered by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) within the Department of Education; (2) describes the coordination of OBEMLA programs with other offices within the Department of Education and other federal agencies and programs; and (3) identifies and discusses key aspects of education programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students. The report begins with a brief overview of the legislative background of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and a discussion of how bilingual education relates to the six national educational goals identified by the President and governors. The second chapter addresses the identification, placement, and demographic characteristics of LEP students. Chapter 3 describes results of research on LEP instructional strategies, program evaluations, capacity building, and training of educational personnel. The fourth chapter focuses on OBEMLA's role in administering programs authorized by the legislation. The final chapter contains a policy analysis and recommendations for future federal involvement. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352816

THE CONDITION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE NATION:

A Report to the Congress and the President

United States Department of Education
Office of the Secretary

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

June 30, 1992

FL 020 799

THE CONDITION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE NATION:

A Report to the Congress and the President

United States Department of Education
Office of the Secretary

June 30, 1992

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	THE IDENTIFICATION, PLACEMENT, AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LEP STUDENTS	9
III	RESEARCH FINDINGS ON INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES, PERSONNEL TRAINING, AND CAPACITY BUILDING	36
IV	OBEMLA BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT ACTIVITIES . .	62
V	CRITICAL CHALLENGES FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

Under the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, P.L. 100-297, Title VI, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education is required to prepare and submit to the Congress and the President a report on the condition of bilingual education in the nation on June 30, 1992. This document fulfills this mandate by:

1. reporting on programmatic, research, and training activities administered by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), the office within the Department charged with the administration and operation of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act (The Bilingual Education Act);

2. describing the coordination of OBEMLA programs with other offices within the Department and other federal agencies and programs; and

3. identifying and discussing key aspects of education programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students.

The report begins with a brief legislative background of the Bilingual Education Act and a discussion of how bilingual education relates to the six national education goals identified by the President and the nation's governors. Chapter II provides a discussion of the identification, placement, and demographic characteristics of limited English proficient (LEP) students. Chapter III describes the results of research studies on LEP instructional strategies, program evaluations, capacity building, and the training of educational personnel. Chapter IV focuses on the role of OBEMLA in administering programs authorized by the Bilingual Education Act. Chapter V presents a policy analysis and recommendations for future federal involvement.

THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

The Bilingual Education Act was enacted on January 1, 1968 as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). It has been commonly known as Title VII ever since. Its initial purpose was to provide federal funding to local educational agencies (LEAs) for programs teaching English acquisition through bilingual education instruction. The funding was in the form of discretionary or competitive grants that were rated primarily on the quality of their applications. Initial funding for Fiscal Year 1969 was $7.5 million; current Fiscal Year 1992 funding is $195 million.

The Act was reauthorized, or continued, four times--in 1974, 1978, 1984, and 1988--and its current authorization expires on September 30, 1993. Congress will consider the reauthorization of the Act, along with other sections of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in its 103rd Congress in 1993.

Several features were added to the original Bilingual Education Act as part of these four reauthorizations. Among these:

1. a training program for educational personnel;

2. a research agenda;

3. a fellowship program for graduate students;

4. a state education agency grant program;

5. new instructional programs including developmental bilingual education, special alternative instructional programs, family English literacy programs, and a special populations program;

6. a service and information network including the Multifunctional Resource Centers, the Evaluation Assistance Centers and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education;

7. a dissemination system for exemplary programs.

The program's area of greatest activity was originally confined to a few states that included most of the identified LEP student population at the time. Since then, Title VII has expanded to serve every state. This fact is attributable to the growth and diversity of the LEP population and to the involvement of many more state and local educational agencies in the identification of and provision of services to the LEP students within their jurisdictions.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

President George Bush and the nation's governors met in September, 1989, at an education summit in Charlottesville, Virginia. Following the summit the President and the governors adopted six National Education Goals to be met by the year 2000. The Department believes that instructional programs funded under the Bilingual Education Act directly relate to these goals in that they allow limited English proficient students to meet grade promotion and graduation standards. In addition, OBEMLA has implemented a series of other measures to address the national goals as they relate to limited English proficient students. These goals and targeted OBEMLA initiatives taken to support them are:

By the Year 2000:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.

OBEMLA issued an invitational priority to encourage preschool programs that address this goal to apply for grants under the Special Populations program. Funding for this program has increased from $6.9 million in Fiscal Year 1991 to $8 million in Fiscal Year 1992.

2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

OBEMLA has conducted an inventory of current classroom instruction, training, and research projects to identify special initiatives among them which give special attention to this goal. OBEMLA has also provided answers to commonly asked questions about LEP student dropout prevention to the Department's AMERICA 2000 informational data base.

3. American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

OBEMLA has launched a special competition with an absolute priority for developmental bilingual education and special alternative instructional programs in magnet middle schools. These programs must emphasize the learning of the content subjects including: history, geography, mathematics, and science.

4. U.S students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

OBEMLA has issued a science and mathematics invitational priority for its Special Alternative Instructional Program (SAIP) and its Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs. OBEMLA has proposed a $20 million absolute priority for SAIP and TBE programs that emphasize science and mathematics instruction. These priorities involve the use of science and mathematics to teach English. OBEMLA plans to issue an invitational priority in Fiscal Year 1993 for the Short Term Training Program. This invitational priority will encourage training in the areas of mathematics and science. OBEMLA is also establishing an absolute priority for Fiscal Year 1993 for the Education Personnel Training Program. This priority will be funded by $2.5 million and will request training proposals to address the areas of mathematics and science.

5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global

economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

OBEMLA is encouraging parent participation in the schools under the Family English Literacy Program. Funding has increased from $4.9 million in Fiscal Year 1990 to $5.5 million in Fiscal Year 1991 to $6.1 million in Fiscal Year 1992. OBEMLA also sponsored a symposium and a workshop on parental leadership and participation at its January, 1992, Management Institute for Title VII grantees.

6. Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) has, at the direction of OBEMLA, published a program information guide for LEP secondary students that deals with ways of coping with the threat of drugs and violence in the schools. The Clearinghouse has also published four occasional papers on this subject.

Several OBEMLA initiatives address the National Educational Goals as a group. One of these is being carried out under the Training Development and Improvement Priority. Institutions of higher education have been selected to set up training institutes. These institutes will train deans, curriculum developers, and others in strengthening multilingual and multicultural concepts

into the curriculum of their education faculties. This training includes instruction on practices that support the National Education Goals.

Another OBEMLA initiative is the publication and dissemination by the National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education (NCBE) of seven brochures. These brochures relate to each goal and to the goals as a whole. Each explains the goal or goals and lists pertinent NCBE publications.

Finally, OBEMLA has co-chaired the Intradepartmental Task Force on Goal 2 and assigned OBEMLA staff members to the other five Task Forces in order to represent the needs of LEP students in each topical area.

CHAPTER II

THE IDENTIFICATION, PLACEMENT, AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LEP STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION-OBEMLA'S Perspective on the Challenge of Identifying LEP Students

The identification of limited English proficient (LEP) students in states or school districts depends largely on determinations by state and local education authorities. A range of identification methods and procedures are used by various SEAs and LEAs. The definition of who is a LEP student is the foundation of this identification. The Bilingual Education Act or Title VII provides a broad definition for participants in its program.

The Act's definition of limited English proficiency and limited English proficient is found in Section 7003 of the Bilingual Education Act:

> (1) The terms "limited English proficiency" and "limited English proficient" when used with reference to individuals means-
>
> (A) individuals who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;
>
> (B) individuals who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant; and
>
> (C) individuals who are American Indian and Alaska Natives and who come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency;

> and who, by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to deny such individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in our society.

This definition is limited to a description of LEP status relative to a student's inability to function in the all-English classroom. The Bilingual Education Act is silent on specific identification criteria or procedures that SEAs or LEAs may use in order to participate in the Title VII program. Participation in Bilingual Education Act programs is voluntary; SEAs and LEAs are free to participate in the competition for grant awards, or not to participate if they so choose. OBEMLA does, however, require SEA grantees to state the definition/criteria used to identify LEP students and the method(s) used to make this identification within their state.

OBEMLA works to clarify and improve the state and school district identification process. OBEMLA devised a new SEA grant data collection form that helps states clearly describe their identification procedures. OBEMLA collaborated with the Council of Chief State School Officers in their efforts to encourage SEAs to develop and clarify their identification procedures.

OBEMLA believes that a thorough identification process involves, first, a home language survey to determine if any language other than English is spoken in the home. If the survey produces a positive response to this question, at least one objective and one subjective measure of English proficiency should be employed. The objective measure could be a standardized or locally-devised

achievement test. Scoring below a certain percentile ranking would signify LEP status. Subjective measures could include recommendations from parents, classroom teachers, counselors, or others with direct knowledge of the student's ability to learn and perform in an all-English classroom.

IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES USED BY SEAs AND LEAs

The absence of federally mandated identification procedures for participation in Title VII leaves the field open for state or local district definitions. Some states have laws, policies, regulations, or court decisions that establish a common statewide procedure that is used to identify a LEP student. Some states may choose to adopt the Title VII definition of LEP students as their partial or entire statewide definition. States may mandate or recommend a range of specific options on objective and subjective measures. This means that SEAs might inform their LEAs that they are to use either Test A or Test B or Test C in their identification procedures. Other states may permit their LEAs to use locally developed tests. Still other states may allow LEAs to use whatever procedure they want. Finally states may be silent on the issue and offer no guidance or regulations to its LEAs.

States that receive Title VII State Educational Agency grants report both the criteria/definition used to identify LEP students and a method used to identify LEP students. The criteria/definition and the methods used to identify LEP students are displayed in Table A. This table reveals a pattern of states' heavy reliance on non-English language background as the LEP

definition/criteria. Home language surveys are used to capture information on the language or languages spoken in students' homes. These surveys may ask a variety of questions such as:

1. language primarily used at home;
2. language first acquired;
3. language used most often;
4. language spoken to parents;
5. language spoken to siblings;
6. language spoken to friends.

Another type of criteria/definition used in many states is a student's difficulty with four aspects of English language proficiency-reading, writing, speaking, and understanding. Other common criteria/definition are standardized achievement or language proficiency tests with a specific cutoff or threshold score, oral interviews, and academic performance below grade level.

TABLE A

IDENTIFICATION CRITERIA

STATE	CRITERIA/DEFINITION	IDENTIFICATION METHODS: STUDENT RECORDS — TEACHER OBSERVA.		TEACHER INTERVIEW — REF-ERRAL		PARENT INFO — STUDENT GRADE		HOME SURVEY — INFORMAL ASSESSMT	
AK	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
AL	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Observation; Assessment	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AR	Arkansas Student Assessment	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AZ	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Test w/ 40th. %ile Cutoff	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
CA	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Assess for Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CO	Checklist; Language or Achievement Test	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
CT	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Oral Test;30%ile; Interview	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
DC	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DE	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
FL	Survey; Oral Test; Instrument; LEP Committee	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
GA	No Information	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HI	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; 30%ile-Lang/Reading; 25%ile-Math	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
IA	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
ID	Engl Skills Insufficient to Receive Inst in Engl	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
IL	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IN	Limited Engl Abilities & Below Grade Performance	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
KS	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;4 Proficiencies;Below Grade	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
KY	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
LA	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Oral Test;Stnd Test-36th%ile	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MA	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Unable Perform Engl Classwrk	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
MD	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Local Determination	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ME	Title VII LEP Definition	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MI	Test-40th.%ile Cut Off	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
MN	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Below Avg Reading/Lang Score	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

TABLE A (cont.)

STATE	CRITERIA/DEFINITION	IDENTIFICATION METHODS							
		STUDENT RECORDS		TEACHER INTERVIEW		PARENT INFO		HOME SURVEY	
		TEACHER OBSERVA.		REF-ERRAL		STUDENT GRADE		INFORMAL ASSESSMT	
MO	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Below Avg 4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
MS	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MT	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;4 Proficiencies;40%ile Cutoff	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NC	Inability in 4 Proficiencies; Local Definitions	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ND	No State Definition;Each School Determines Its Own	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NE	No State Definition; Each LEA Determines Its Own	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
NH	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Not Achieving on Par w/Peers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
NJ	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
NM	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Std Test; 40th%ile Cut Off	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
NV	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NY	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Understand/Speak;40%ile Cut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
OH	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
OK	Title LEP Definition; Local Determination	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
OR	No Specific Criterion	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
PA	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
RI	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Std Reading Test-40%ile Cut	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
SC	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
SD	Below 50th %ile are served by biling. or ESL prgm.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TN	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd; Local Determination	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
TX	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Reading/Lang Subtests-40%ile	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
UT	No Information	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
VA	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
VT	ESEA Title VII Public Law 100-297, 7003, (a)(b)(c)	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
WA	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Choice of Approved Tests	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WI	Difficulty w/ 4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WV	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Difficulty w/4 Proficiencies	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

TABLE A (cont.)

STATE	CRITERIA/DEFINITION	IDENTIFICATION METHODS: STUDENT RECORDS		TEACHER INTERVIEW		PARENT INFO		HOME SURVEY	
		TEACHER OBSERVA.		REF-ERRAL		STUDENT GRADE		INFORMAL ASSESSMT	
WY	No State Definition-LEA Determined	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
AS	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Dominant Lang is Not English	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
CN	Language Proficiency and Achievement Test	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
GU	Non-Engl Lang Bckgrnd;Tchr Referral;Test-39th%ile	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PR	New Arrivals w/ Little or No Knowledge of Spanish	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
TT	Locally Developed Language Arts Testing	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
VI	No Information	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT

Once the identification of students with limited English proficiency is made, the next step may be to assess precisely the student's level of English language proficiency in order to provide services. This assessment may be in the form of a test to gauge the student's ability to carry out one or more of the following functions in English: speaking, understanding, reading, and writing. Fifty-one SEAs reported on the major assessment instrument used. These data are displayed in Table B.

After assessing the language proficiency level, LEAs usually refer these students to a LEP instructional program. This program may take many forms and may have different types of funding sources. States have reported a duplicated count of LEP students enrolled in more than one federal, state, and local program. The federal programs in this category are Chapter 1, Even Start, Emergency Immigrant Education, Special Education, Title VII, and other federal programs. Title VII is further broken down by type of program in Table D. State-by-state involvement in these federal programs is displayed in Table C. The state and local program participation on a state-by-state basis is also reported in Table C. It is evident that federal programs other than Title VII serve significant numbers of LEP students. For example, Chapter I serves many more LEP students than Title VII. The Emergency Immigrant Education program serves a LEP student population that approximates

TABLE B

MAJOR INSTRUMENTS USED BY SEAS TO ASSESS ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, ACADEMIC YEAR 1990-1991

STATE	MAJOR INSTRUMENT USED
AK	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
AL	Stanford Achievement Test
AR	Arkansas Student Assessment District Reading Instruments
CA	District Selected Norm-Referenced Tests
CO	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
CT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
DC	California Test of Basic Skills
DE	Stanford Achievement Test
FL	Peabody Vocabulary Test
GA	District Determined
HI	Stanford Achievement Test
IA	Iowa Test of Educational Development
ID	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
IL	District Determined, State Approved
IN	Language Assessment Scales
KS	California Achievement Test
KY	No Information
LA	California Achievement Test
MA	Language Assessment Scales
MD	California Test of Basic Skills
ME	Maine Education Assessment
MI	MDE Evaluation Report
MN	California Achievement Test
MO	Missouri Mastery & Achievement Tests
MS	Stanford Achievement Test
MT	SRA
NC	California Achievement Test
ND	California Test of Basic Skills
NE	SRA
NH	District Determined
NJ	No Information
M	California Test of Basic Skills
NV	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
NY	District Selected Norm-Referenced Tests

TABLE B (cont.)

STATE	MAJOR INSTRUMENT USED
OH	California Test of Basic Skills
OK	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
OR	Language Assessment Scales
PA	No Information
RI	MAT-6
SC	No Information
SD	Stanford Achievement Test
TN	TCAP
TX	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
UT	Stanford Achievement Test
VA	No Information
VT	Brigance
WA	District Selected Norm-Referenced Tests
WI	IPT
WV	California Test of Basic Skills
WY	California Achievement Test
AS	Stanford Achievement Test
CN	California Achievement Test
GU	Stanford Achievement Test
PR	Aprenda
TT	DRP
VI	No Information

TABLE C *

IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENTS in FEDERAL, STATE and LOCAL PROGRAMS, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1990-1991

STATE	TITLE VII	CHAPTER 1 PRGMS	EMERGENCY EVEN-START	EMERGENCY IMMI-GRANT	SPECIAL ED.	OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS	STATE & LOCAL PROGRAMS
AK	783	1,087	0	0	1	0	11,184
AL	700	95	0	0	33	0	0
AR	0	115	0	0	0	269	0
AZ	12,848	1	1	11,470	7,797	0	52,632
CA	118,325	499,594	1	1	53,548	71,787	986,462
CO	1,485	3,487	0	1,345	202	845	11,054
CT	1,143	8,447	43	4,110	293	14,036	0
DC	1,177	556	0	1,001	0	0	2,768
DE	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
FL	2,301	5,822	0	18,697	5,161	3,677	64,742
GA	104	600	1	3,032	1	0	5,882
HI	1,425	0	0	2,904	0	0	9,654
IA	1,293	1	1	639	95	0	3,299
ID	15	1,777	0	0	249	2,494	1
IL	4,633	856	1	32,888	1,908	0	71,857
IN	557	766	0	0	282	0	1,303
KS	140	461	1	1,905	148	0	4,440
KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA	1,155	2,855	0	2,103	0	3,158	3,561
MA	4,667	4,400	1	16,928	12,130	0	37,997
MD	629	1,437	48	8,442	644	370	2,011
ME	1,140	113	0	0	37	745	1,238
MI	0	1	1	2,375	1	0	0
MN	3,387	3,355	0	7,518	887	0	12,982
MO	301	1	0	552	1	0	0
MS	1,612	429	0	0	63	613	245
MT	4,324	752	36	106	583	2,028	758
NC	1,022	611	7	0	88	834	2,994
ND	1,431	1	1	0	627	0	0
NE	517	1	1	0	42	0	1
NH	165	259	0	0	114	0	851
NJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NM	9,188	24,671	175	4,760	17,943	19,643	53,742
NV	0	0	0	0	0	931	7,838
NY	33,195	63,733	1	77,575	6,911	0	148,337
OH	4,670	2,293	0	786	193	291	12,926
OK	5,946	1,588	1	588	0	45	5,358
OR	7,150	1	30	300	600	0	0

* This Table tallies the responses to Part I, A, 4 of the SEA Reports, which provides a duplicated count of LEP student participation in various programs. The numbers reported in this table by the SEAs do not necessarily correspond to participation levels the Department has reported elsewhere.

TABLE C * (cont.)

STATE	TITLE VII	CHAPTER 1 PRGMS	EMERGENCY EVEN-START	EMERGENCY IMMI-GRANT	SPECIAL ED.	OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS	STATE & LOCAL PROGRAMS
PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	0	806	29	7,015	330	0	0
SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TN	1,188	784	0	1,425	90	0	3,502
TX	11,405	1	1	1	26,611	0	0
UT	746	0	0	7,229	920	0	2,432
VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VT	0	78	0	0	36	0	152
WA	2,776	1	184	12,732	1	0	28,473
WI	0	2,240	0	1,593	673	1,392	11,837
WV	0	124	1	1	7	0	88
WY	219	438	110	0	121	0	162
AS	448	0	0	0	54	0	3,517
CN	864	0	0	0	0	0	0
GU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PR	5,000	515,820	0	2,267	4,292	51,371	17,679
TT	884	2,677	0	0	300	0	0
VI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	250,958	1,153,136	677	232,288	144,018	174,529	1,583,962

---

* This Table tallies the responses to Part I, A, 4 of the SEA Reports, which provides a duplicated count of LEP student participation in various programs. The numbers reported in this table by the SEAs do not necessarily correspond to participation levels the Department has reported elsewhere.

TABLE D *

IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENTS IN TITLE VII PROGRAMS REPORTED BY SEAs, ACADEMIC YEAR 1990-1991

STATE	TBE	DBE	SAIP	RECENT ARRIVALS	MAGNET-SCHOOLS	FELP	SPECIAL POPs.	TOTALS
AK	273	0	262	0	0	24	224	783
AL	0	700	0	0	0	0	0	700
AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AZ	9,857	0	2,991	0	0	0	0	12,848
CA	100,679	965	12,692	0	0	2,525	1,464	118,325
CO	685	0	520	0	0	200	80	1,485
CT	1,143	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,143
DC	187	0	990	0	0	0	0	1,177
DE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	1,251	200	350	0	0	500	0	2,301
GA	0	0	0	0	0	104	0	104
HI	432	0	993	0	0	0	0	1,425
IA	1,293	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,293
ID	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
IL	2,068	250	2,315	0	0	0	0	4,633
IN	146	0	65	0	0	346	0	557
KS	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,155
MA	291	412	0	0	0	0	0	4,667
MD	131	0	498	0	0	0	0	629
ME	266	0	264	0	0	0	40	1,140
MI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MN	3,292	0	0	0	0	95	0	3,387
MO	248	0	53	0	0	0	0	301
MS	153	0	169	0	0	0	0	1,612
MT	1,826	0	316	0	0	20	0	4,324
NC	327	0	0	0	0	0	184	1,022
ND	1,431	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,431
NE	375	0	142	0	0	0	0	517
NH	0	0	165	0	0	0	0	165
NJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NM	8,339	0	0	0	0	0	849	9,188
NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	26,404	520	4,304	0	0	995	970	33,193
OH	4,571	0	99	0	0	0	0	4,670
OK	1,580	0	832	0	0	233	328	5,946
OR	1,990	150	720	0	0	360	430	7,150

---

* This Table tallies the responses to Part I, A, 4 of the SEA Reports, which provides a count of LEP student participation in ESEA Title VII programs. The numbers reported in this table by the SEAs do not necessarily correspond to participation levels the Department has reported elsewhere.

TABLE D * (cont.)

STATE	TBE	DBE	SAIP	RECENT ARRIVALS	MAGNET-SCHOOLS	FELP	SPECIAL POPs.	TOTALS
PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD	3,864	0	406	0	0	0	0	0
TN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,188
TX	8,792	100	2,413	0	100	0	0	11,405
UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	746
VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WA	2,607	0	107	0	0	0	62	2,776
WI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WY	50	0	109	0	0	0	60	219
AS	448	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
CN	864	0	0	0	0	0	0	864
GU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PR	4,775	0	0	0	0	225	0	5,000
TT	463	0	421	0	0	0	0	884
VI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	191,241	3,312	32,196	0	100	5,627	4,691	250,958

---

* This Table tallies the responses to Part I, A, 4 of the SEA Reports, which provides a count of LEP student participation in ESEA Title VII programs. The numbers reported in this table by the SEAs do not necessarily correspond to participation levels the Department has reported elsewhere.

the population served under Title VII. Title VII serves approximately 309,849 students as reported by the SEAs. This is about 15 percent of the national LEP total.

State and locally funded programs serve almost as many LEP students as Chapter I, Title VII and other federally funded programs combined, as seen in Table C. There are about 1,584,000 LEP students in state and locally funded programs vs. about 1,722,000 LEP students in federally funded programs. The funding pattern, however, is uneven. Some states have large state and locally funded programs, while others have few or none. Some states use federally funded programs to serve a significant portion of the LEP student population, while others rely mainly on state or local funds for this purpose.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Recent studies and state reports provide valuable information about both the presence of LEP students nationwide and the instructional services that they are receiving. A National Center for Education Statistics study concentrates on Asian and Hispanic students.[1] A shortcoming of this study, failing to distinguish the LEP population from the larger language minority population, is being addressed for follow-up studies. With OBEMLA's assistance, the study augmented the sample for its first follow-up study by adding a LEP sample. The results of a focus on this new sample

[1]"National Center for Education Statistics, Language Characteristics and Academic Achievement: A Look at Asian and Hispanic Eighth Graders in NELS: 88," 1992.

will be seen in the second follow-up study which will have longitudinal data on LEP students. These Asian and Hispanic students are the major components of the language minority student population. Language minority students are those whose family or home language was other than English; a part of this population is English proficient and another part is not. This study is part of the National Longitudinal Study of 1988, known as NELS, which examined a representative sample of 25,000 eighth graders in 1988. This aspect of the study examines Asian and Hispanic students.

The Asian language minority student population is quite diverse. About 20 percent are of Filipino background, 17 percent of Chinese origin and another 13 percent of Southeast Asian origin. Other significant groups include students of Korean, Pacific Islander, and Japanese origins. About 75 percent of Asian students come from bilingual families and most rate themselves as having a high proficiency in English and a low proficiency in their native languages. Those with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to possess high English proficiency than those from lower socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status also appears to affect achievement in basic reading and mathematics performance. Those with higher socioeconomic status performed better than those with lower status.

The Hispanic language minority student population is also diverse. About two thirds are of Mexican background, about 11 percent of Puerto Rican background, and about 4 percent of Cuban background. Twenty-three percent described themselves as coming

from "other Hispanic" backgrounds. Most Hispanics also came from bilingual homes and most described themselves as having a low proficiency in the home language and a high proficiency in English. Like the Asian sample, school performance and English proficiency appeared to be affected by socioeconomic status. Those with high status appear to achieve at a higher level in school and to have a greater degree of English proficiency, those with lower status did the opposite.

A recent California SEA-funded study of the LEP students in the state entitled "Meeting the Challenge of Language Diversity" also provides insight on LEP student demographics. California's nearly 1 million LEP students are characterized by "extraordinary diversity." This diversity is

> ...compounded in numerous schools by the presence of children from several-sometimes many-linguistically and culturally distinct groups that comprise California's language minority population. Almost one hundred languages are represented in California's schools, and it was not unusual in our case study sites to see children from Asia, the Pacific Islands, the Middle East, or Eastern Europe, often in the same class.
>
> Nor does the composition of LEP children at schools remain the same within any one year or from year to year. Particular children may leave or enter school at different times, and the demographic circumstances in many schools of today change in unpredictable ways over the life of a program. Schools in the case study sites experienced successive changes in their non-English language groups within a short period of time-for example, one school had developed a bilingual program for its predominantly Spanish speaking LEP population and then had to cope with ensuing waves of Afghan and Russian immigrants.
>
> The flux of students is aggravated by high transiency rates among many LEP students with the related but separate problem of low attendance. The case study schools varied greatly in the extent of transiency, with the most mobile student populations being in communities that served as points of entry for immigration or had a

> high proportion of migrant workers-in some cases only a minority of students that began a school year were still in the same school by the end of the year. Coping with the unpredictability of students moving in and out of school can tax the best designed programs.
>
> To put the matter simply, the reality faced by school people in educating LEP students is complex, generally requiring innovative and particular solutions to match the complexity of student diversity and needs.[2]

OBEMLA collects annual SEA grant report information which is mandated in Part B of the Bilingual Education Act. Each SEA grantee submits data on overall student enrollment, LEP student enrollment, and instructional services for LEP students. OBEMLA's Research and Evaluation Staff aggregate and analyze this data. The form on which this data is reported was devised with the assistance of the Research and Evaluation Staff.

The SEA reports reveal a nationwide total of 2,263,682 identified LEP students that have been reported by all 57 SEAs for Fiscal Year 1990-1991 as seen in Table E. This total includes public and private school LEP figures. Table E also displays an overall State-reported enrollment of 40,471,612. The LEP student population equals 6 percent of the reported total enrollment or about one in every 20 students.

Last year there were 1,981,112 identified LEP students; this year there are 2,263,682; approximately a 14.3 percent increase over the FY 1989-1990 figure. Both of these figures are reported in Table F. These totals include estimated figures from Pennsylvania and Virginia,

---

[2]BW Associates, "Meeting the Challenge of Cultural Diversity" 1992.

TABLE E

IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS REPORTED BY SEAs

STATE	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	ENROLLMENT TOTALS	IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENT TOTALS	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS *	IDENTIFIED LEPs WHO COULD BENEFIT FROM PROGRAMS **
AK	112,190	4,385	116,575	11,184	11,184	11,184
AL	721,806	8,296	730,102	1,052	261	1,052
AR	434,679	18,700	453,379	2,000		
AZ	67,934	28,235	699,169	65,727	54,010	11,717
CA	4,950,474	531,489	5,481,963	986,462	742,654	243,808
CO	574,213	36,580	610,793	17,187	9,746	7,441
CT	463,186	67,009	530,195	16,988	15,141	1,847
DC	80,694	10,339	91,033	3,379	2,768	
DE	99,658	22,353	122,011	1,969	885	1,084
FL	1,861,592	193,939	2,055,531	83,937	64,742	19,195
GA	1,141,218	59,751	1,200,969	6,487	6,036	885
HI	171,056	33,254	204,310	9,730	9,699	9,685
IA	483,399	46,117	529,516	3,705	3,326	379
ID	214,571	7,037	221,608	3,986	3,467	573
IL	1,821,407	318,625	2,140,032	79,291	71,857	7,434
IN	953,228	95,915	1,049,143	4,670	1,815	2,855
KS	437,034	28,323	465,357	4,661	4,440	221
KY				1,071		
LA	787,753	118,384	906,137	8,345	5,769	2,559
MA	836,383	125,586	961,969	42,606	38,296	4,310
MD	700,816	100,244	807,060	12,701	12,581	120
ME	204,710	11,462	216,172	1,983	745	1,238
MI	1,485,830	181,296	1,667,126	37,112	18,048	18,048
MN	749,203	81,262	830,465	13,204	12,982	222
MO	810,450	105,337	915,787	3,815	3,815	
MS	500,122	48,155	548,277	2,753		199
MT	153,090	8,950	162,040	6,635	2,268	4,367
NC	1,076,409	53,372	1,129,781	6,030	3,104	957
ND	117,134	9,075	126,209	7,187	2,058	5,129
NE	274,080	37,158	311,238	1,257	940	317
NH	172,785	18,789	191,574	1,146	851	295
NJ				47,560		
NM	301,888	26,980	328,862	73,505	53,106	24,262

* Total unduplicated count of LEP students enrolled in federal, state and local programs (Part I, A, 3 of the SEA Report).

** Total number of LEP students who are not enrolled in programs and who need or could benefit from educational programs (Part I, A, 5 of SEA Report).

[ ] Blank cells indicate that the state did not participate in the SEA Program, or that information was not available from the participating state.

TABLE E (cont.)

STATE	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	ENROLLMENT TOTALS	IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENT TOTALS	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS *	IDENTIFIED LEPs WHO COULD BENEFIT FROM PROGRAMS **
NV	201,316	9,425	210,741	9,057	8,830	227
NY	2,547,258	477,107	3,024,365	168,208	151,088	17,120
OH	1,771,089	224,030	1,995,119	8,992	2,717	6,275
OK	579,167	10,858	590,025	15,860	8,435	13,510
OR	472,245	29,835	502,080	7,557	3,126	4,431
PA				15,000		
RI	137,563	21,974	159,037	7,632	7,632	7,632
SC				1,205		
SD	128,635	14,190	142,825	6,691	3,864	2,827
TN	880,246	67,613	947,859	3,660	3,530	130
TX	3,379,069	151,713	3,530,782	313,234	286,910	26,324
UT	435,882	7,918	443,800	14,860	3,179	11,681
VA				15,130		
VT	95,758	2,868	98,626	500	288	212
WA	839,709	63,612	903,321	28,646	28,580	66
WI	797,621	144,215	941,836	14,648	13,850	798
WV	322,355	13,731	336,086	231	57	174
WY	98,226	1,021	99,247	1,919	885	1,034
AS	10,838	1,863	12,701	11,842	4,895	6,947
CN	6,464	1,944	8,408	7,568	2,515	5,053
GU	26,542		26,542	2,309	2,309	2,309
PR	644,734	45,605	690,339	33,722	4,775	28,947
TT	2,677	813	3,490	3,486	3,486	3,486
VI				2,400		
TOTALS	36,136,386	3,726,732	40,471,612	2,263,682	1,697,545	520,566

* Total unduplicated count of LEP students enrolled in federal, state and local programs (Part I, A, 3 of the SEA Report).

** Total number of LEP students who are not enrolled in programs and who need or could benefit from educational programs (Part I, A, 5 of SEA Report).

[ ] Blank cells indicate that the state did not participate in the SEA Program, or that information was not available from the participating state.

TABLE F

IDENTIFIED LEP STUDENTS IN 1990 AND 1991 AS REPORTED BY SEAs

STATE	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN 1990	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN 1991	CHANGE FROM 1990 TO 1991	PERCENT OF CHANGE FROM 1990 TO 1991
ALASKA	11,489	11,184	-305	-2.7
ALABAMA		1,052	1,052	***.*
ARKANSAS		2,000	2,000	***.*
ARIZONA	60,270	65,727	5,457	9.1
CALIFORNIA	861,531	986,462	124,931	14.5
COLORADO	15,011	17,187	2,176	14.5
CONNECTICUT		16,988	16,988	***.*
DISTRICT COLUMBIA	3,417	3,379	-38	-1.1
DELAWARE	1,470	1,969	499	33.9
FLORIDA	61,768	83,937	22,169	35.9
GEORGIA	6,194	6,487	293	4.7
HAWAII	8,299	9,730	1,431	17.2
IOWA	3,603	3,705	102	2.8
IDAHO	3,440	3,986	546	15.9
ILLINOIS	73,185	79,291	6,106	8.3
INDIANA	4,001	4,670	669	16.7
KANSAS	4,789	4,661	-128	-2.7
KENTUCKY	1,344	1,071	-273	-20.3
LOUISIANA	7,088	8,345	1,257	17.7
MASSACHUSETTS	40,057	42,606	2,549	6.4
MARYLAND	10,787	12,701	1,914	17.7
MAINE	1,822	1,983	161	8.8
MICHIGAN	33,449	37,112	3,663	11.0
MINNESOTA	11,858	13,204	1,346	11.4
MISSOURI	2,844	3,815	971	34.1
MISSISSIPPI	2,651	2,753	102	3.8
MONTANA	6,286	6,635	349	5.6
NORTH CAROLINA	4,586	6,030	1,444	31.5
NORTH DAKOTA	7,187	7,187	0	0.0
NEBRASKA	918	1,257	339	36.9

***.* Percent of change is not applicable for those states which did not receive a Title VII SEA grant and for those that did not provide 1990 figures.

Negative numbers and percentages indicate reported decreases in LEP counts from the State Education Agencies.

Blank spaces indicate that the state did not participate in the SEA Program, or that information was not available from the participating state.

TABLE F (cont.)

STATE	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN 1990	IDENTIFIED LEPs IN 1991	CHANGE FROM 1990 TO 1991	PERCENT OF CHANGE FROM 1990 TO 1991
NEW HAMPSHIRE	664	1,146	482	72.6
NEW JERSEY	43,176	47,560	4,384	10.2
NEW MEXICO	58,752	73,505	14,753	25.1
NEVADA	7,423	9,057	1,634	22.0
NEW YORK	158,007	168,208	10,201	6.5
OHIO	8,526	8,992	466	5.5
OKLAHOMA	10,606	15,860	5,254	49.5
OREGON	7,557	7,557	0	0.0
PENNSYLVANIA		15,000	15,000	***.*
RHODE ISLAND	6,447	7,632	1,185	18.4
SOUTH CAROLINA		1,205	1,205	***.*
SOUTH DAKOTA	6,048	6,691	643	10.6
TENNESSEE	2,033	3,660	1,627	80.0
TEXAS	309,862	313,234	3,372	1.1
UTAH	18,636	14,860	-3,776	-20.3
VIRGINIA		15,130	15,130	***.*
VERMONT	384	500	116	30.2
WASHINGTON STATE	23,461	28,646	5,185	22.1
WISCONSIN	14,357	14,648	291	2.0
WEST VIRGINIA	273	231	-42	-15.4
WYOMING	2,272	1,919	-353	-15.5
AMERICAN SAMOA	11,761	11,842	81	0.7
NORTHERN MARIANAS	6,471	7,568	1,097	17.0
GUAM		2,309	2,309	***.*
PUERTO RICO	29,305	33,722	4,417	15.1
PALAU	3,517	3,486	-31	-0.9
VIRGIN ISLANDS	2,230	2,400	170	7.6
TOTALS	1,981,112	2,263,682	282,570	14.3

***.* Percent of change is not applicable for those states which did not receive a Title VII SEA grant and for those that did not provide 1990 figures.

Negative numbers and percentages indicate reported decreases in LEP counts from the State Education Agencies.

Blank spaces indicate that the state did not participate in the SEA Program, or that information was not available from the participating state

which did not receive Title VII SEA grants in either of the last two years and are not required to complete a form that includes their LEP figures; and include Puerto Rico's limited Spanish proficient population, rather than its LEP population.

The order of the five largest LEP student population states has changed somewhat within the last year. Florida replaced Illinois as the fourth largest state. The five largest LEP student population states are:

1. California-986,462 LEP students
2. Texas-313,234 LEP students
3. New York-168,208 LEP students
4. Florida- 83,937 LEP students
5. Illinois-79,291 LEP students

This combined total of the five largest states accounts for 73 percent or almost three fourths of the entire nation's LEP population. These states are the nation's population centers and major port-of-entry states, those in which immigrants first enter the country. The next five largest states are:

6. New Mexico-73,505 LEP students
7. Arizona-65,727 LEP students
8. New Jersey-47,560 LEP students
9. Massachusetts-42,606 LEP students
10. Michigan-37,112 LEP students

These states contain an additional 12 percent of the national LEP student population and represent states that are in the same

regions of the country as the top five: the Southwest, Northeast and Midwest. Thirty-four states in all sections of the nation reported gains of five percent or more in their LEP student populations within the last year. These states include: Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Numerically, California gained the most LEP students, from 861,531 to 986,462, a gain of over 120,000 students. Florida also registered a significant numerical gain, from 61,768 to 83,937, a gain of more than 22,000. New York gained more than 10,000 LEP students from 158,007 in 1989-1990 to 168,208 in 1990-1991.

These gains in LEP population are attributable to several significant factors, according to the Title VII SEA grantee reports. These factors include:

1. an influx of new immigrants, mostly from Spanish-speaking countries; and of refugees from Southeast Asia and the former Soviet Union;
2. the settlement of former migrant workers' families in a given school district;
3. a high birthrate among language minority families;

4. improved school district procedures to identify LEP students;
5. better SEA methods to capture LEP data from the LEAs; and
6. redefinition or clarification of the definition of LEP students at state or local district levels.

Nine SEAs reported losses in their LEP populations: Alaska, the District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia, Wyoming and Palau. The largest percentage losses were in Appalachian and Rocky Mountain states: Utah and Kentucky 20 percent; Wyoming 16 percent; and West Virginia 15 percent. The other five states lost a smaller percentage: Alaska lost 3 percent of its LEP student population; the District of Columbia lost 1 percent; Kansas lost 3 percent; South Dakota lost 4 percent; and Palau lost 1 percent.

The figures from Puerto Rico relate to the Bilingual Education Act provision on limited Spanish speakers in Puerto Rico. This provision states that Puerto Rico may "include programs of instruction, teacher training, curriculum development, research, evaluation, and testing designed to improve the English proficiency of children and may also make provision for serving the needs of students of limited proficiency in Spanish." (Section 7021 (j).) In its SEA grantee report for Fiscal Year 1989-1990, Puerto Rico reported its limited Spanish proficient population as 29,305 and its limited English proficient student population as 202,974. In its report for Fiscal Year 1990-1991 enrollment, Puerto Rico

reported only its limited Spanish proficient student population of 33,742.

OBEMLA's Emergency Immigrant Education program serves a large number of incoming students across the country, the majority of whom are LEP. A "Report on the Fiscal Year 1991 Emergency Immigrant Education Program" provides data on this program.[3] Students are eligible for the program if they were not born in any state and if they have been attending schools in any one or more state for less than three complete academic years. LEAs are eligible to receive funds under this program if they enroll a minimum of 500 immigrant students or at least 3 percent of their student enrollment consists of immigrant students. The program is formula funded, meaning that funds are distributed to each state according to the numbers of eligible immigrant students. The states in turn distribute the funds to eligible LEAs.

The study found that for Fiscal Year 1991, 687,335 immigrant students were served nationwide, and school districts received an average of $43 per immigrant student. The fiscal year 1991 numbers are an increase of 85,157 students from the year before. The program is heavily concentrated; 65 percent of eligible immigrant students live in just five states: California, Texas, New York, Illinois, and Florida. The distribution pattern of students in this program closely parallels the profile of LEP students in the Title VII program. The port-of-entry states, states in which the largest

---

[3]AmerInd, Inc., "A Report on the FY 1991 Emergency Immigrant Education Program," 1992.

number of immigrants enter the country, contain the largest student populations in both Title VII and the immigrant education program. Also the five largest states are the same in both programs, although the order differs. Overall, 37 states participated; Table C provides a state-by-state display of the Fiscal Year 1991 programmatic information.

Information on specially-designed LEP instructional programs is important in understanding the condition of bilingual education.

Table C compares the identified LEP student population with the number served by special programs. Nationwide 1,697,545 LEP students are served by special LEP instructional programs of a total identified LEP student population of 2,248,552. About 76 percent of identified LEP students are served by these programs. An analysis of these figures reveals certain clusters of activity in terms of state service patterns.

Some states, for example, serve all of their LEP students. These states are: Alaska, Missouri, Rhode Island, Guam, and Palau. Most states serve 70 percent or more of these students. Several states, on the other hand, serve less than 70 percent of their LEP student population: Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah, West Virginia, Wyoming, American Samoa, Northern Marianas and Puerto Rico. Only one of the ten largest LEP states, Michigan, is in this category.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS ON INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES, PERSONNEL TRAINING, AND CAPACITY BUILDING

INTRODUCTION-OBEMLA'S RESEARCH PRIORITIES

This chapter summarizes recent research findings and recommendations on instructional strategies, programmatic evaluations, educational personnel issues, and capacity building. These research findings and recommendations come from OBEMLA's research agenda, which is maintained by its Research and Evaluation Staff (RES). RES is responsible for devising, managing, and monitoring research study contracts.

These studies examine and analyze various aspects of the delivery of educational services to LEP students as set forth in the Bilingual Education Act. The Act specifies that OBEMLA shall have a division "exclusively responsible for the collection, aggregation, analysis, and publication of data and information on the operation and effectiveness of programs assisted under this title." (Section 7051 (b)(2).) The content of the research agenda is outlined in Part B of the Act, including the following:

1. studies to determine and evaluate effective instructional models;

2. studies to examine the process by which individuals acquire a second language and master subject matter skills;

3. longitudinal studies to measure the effect or impact of Title VII programs;

4. studies to determine effective methods to identify students for LEP instructional services and to assess student progress;

5. studies to determine methods of teaching English to LEP adults;

6. studies to determine effective methods for preservice and in-service training for educational personnel.

OBEMLA's research projects focus on certain aspects of the research agenda, including:

1. research that concentrates on instructional program state-of-the-art developments or innovative approaches;

2. descriptive studies, analyses, and evaluations to improve OBEMLA's management of its own instructional or training programs;

3. projects that create or augment major automated data bases on Title VII information;

4. secondary analyses of large national studies, in order to focus on the LEP student or programmatic involvement in this larger study;

5. analyses of mandated information received by the Department of Education, such as the annual Title VII SEA grantee reports.

This research activity is conducted by contracts awarded through competition. OBEMLA's Research and Evaluation Staff monitors research contracts and serves as the technical representatives to the Department's Office of Grants and Contracts Services, which has the legal responsibility for the contracts.

The research studies' conclusions and recommendations grouped under the levels or areas of activity to which they are most appropriate. These areas are: instructional strategies, program evaluations, education personnel training issues, and capacity building. Major themes are highlighted under each of these areas. It should be noted that several of these studies concentrate on a certain small sample size and may not be generalizable to schools or districts that are significantly different from those in the sample.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

A major longitudinal study compared students involved in instructional programs of three different types: Structured English Immersion-all English with only brief explanatory periods in the native language; and two types of transitional bilingual programs in which the major difference was the time students were supposed to spend in the program (Early Exit-three years vs. Late Exit-five years or more).[4] These students began in kindergarten and were followed by the study for three years. The study noted that instructional delivery in all three programs was limited by a passive learning environment. This environment consisted of a teacher doing most of the talking, while the students either remained silent or answered questions with conditioned responses. This environment is not conducive to improving language production and development. Students must consistently read, write, and speak the language in order to become fully proficient in it.

Another finding is that students learned English language arts and mathematics in all three approaches. Additionally the students' non-English speaking parents were best able to aid and support their children's learning process in the late exit program. The study concludes:

1. LEP students in each program improved their skills in

---

[4]Aguirre Inc, "Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion Strategy, Early-Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language-Minority Children - Final Report," 1991.

mathematics, English, and reading as fast or faster than students in the general population. Substantial instruction in the child's native language does not impede the learning of English or reading skills. English-only instruction in the immersion program through grade three is as effective as the early-exit program in helping LEP students acquire mathematics, English language, and reading skills.

2. Most immersion and early-exit students remain in the program longer than the three years for which the program is designed. Teachers in these programs believe that more than three years are necessary and the study suggests that LEP students "may need prolonged assistance if they are to succeed in an English-only environment" (page 40 of the Aguirre Study; see note 4 on preceding page).

3. Preservice and in-service training programs for teachers of LEP students need to instruct teachers in how to create active learning environments for their students.

4. Parental involvement, particularly in time spent helping students with homework, appears to be greatest in the late-exit programs.

5. Among the three late-exit sites, students in the two sites that used the most Spanish posted higher growth in mathematics

skills than the site which abruptly transitioned into almost all English instruction.

The National Academy of Sciences has recently completed a review of two Departmental studies, one of which is the above-referenced study. The Academy was asked to review the methodology employed by each study, to assess whether additional analyses of the data would be productive, and to provide the Department with advice on conducting such studies in the future. The panel's findings, conclusions, and recommendations are:

- The formal designs of the studies were ill-suited to answer the important policy questions that appear to have motivated them. Because of the poor articulation of study goals and the lack of fit between the discernible goals and the research design, it is unlikely that additional statistical analyses of these data will yield results central to the policy questions to which these studies were originally addressed.

- The absence of clear findings in the studies that distinguish among the effects of treatments and programs relating to bilingual education does not warrant conclusions regarding differences in program effects, in any direction. The studies do not license the conclusion that any one type of program is superior to any other nor that the programs are equally effective.

- The Academy stresses the value of randomized controlled experiments in the area of bilingual education research, and states that few models of successful studies of bilingual educational approaches have used truly randomized experimental design. It does, however, acknowledge that investigators face practical and ethical difficulties in doing so.

- Though the families in late-exit programs were from far more economically disadvantaged backgrounds than families in the immersion and early-exit programs, the former monitored completion of homework considerably more than the latter. At the same time, though late-exit students had less preschool experience than students in the other programs, the late-exit parents appeared to be as literate as parents in the other two programs as measured by subscriptions to Spanish-language newspapers. The late-exit students scored at or above the norm in standardized tests, suggesting a relationship between the use of the native language in instruction, native literacy in the home, parental involvement in homework, and student achievement.

- Early-exit programs appear to be more successful in reading than immersion programs at the kindergarten and first-grade levels. Because of the early age of these children, concerns about preobservation treatment effects are not severe. By

grades 1-3, however, differences in student achievement by program are not easily distinguished from possible differences in where the students started. Because after first grade an additional cohort of students was added, and because it is not clear which program these students were in during kindergarten and first grade, we cannot draw similar conclusions about grades 1-3. The report says that comparing the two populations would be like watching a baseball game beginning in the fifth inning: if you are not told the score from prior innings, you cannot tell who is winning the game.

- Taking fully into account the limitations of the studies, they did contain elements of positive relationships that are consistent with empirical results from other studies and that support the theory underlying native-language instruction in bilingual education, whether the amount of such instruction is limited, as in immersion programs, or whether the amount is substantial, as in an early or late-exit programs.

The Academy's main recommendations for future efforts consist of the following:

- Avoid overly ambitious large-scale studies implemented in broad national populations, and concentrate instead on smaller-scale comparative studies of different programs as they apply to different communities. The Academy states that

the Department of Education, in its efforts to evaluate program effectiveness, places far too much emphasis on obtaining "representative" data, and not enough emphasis on obtaining complete, high-quality data for a more restrictive population of interest.

- Base research and evaluation on an explicit theory for learning, either of language or school subject matter. Absence of such a base inevitably leads to vague and inconsistent methods to operationalize treatments, outcomes, and measurements. The implicit theory on which the two studies were based was almost exclusively concerned with the amount and duration of native-language instruction, and therefore inadequate. The Department should ask, for example, whether this dimension is really separable from community, demographic, and historical and other factors that form the context of the schooling process.

- Do not seek to fund any specific additional analyses of the data from these studies; they are unlikely to change assessment of the conclusions that can be drawn from the studies. The data and associated documentation from both studies should, however, be archived and made publicly available.

A recent California SEA-funded study entitled "Meeting the Challenge of Language Diversity" provides insight on the state's five major LEP instructional programs.[5] The programs examined were:

1. Bilingual Late Exit
2. Bilingual Early Exit
3. Double Immersion
4. Sheltered English
5. English as a Second Language (ESL) Pull-out

Programs 1, 2 and 3 make use of the LEP students' native languages and English; 1 and 2 approximate the programs by the same name in the preceding study. Double Immersion approximates the Title VII Developmental Bilingual Education program in which LEP students and native English-speaking students receive instruction in both languages with the common goal of bilingual literacy. Programs 4 and 5 use only English as the medium of instruction. In ESL pullout, LEP students are removed from their self-contained classroom for a special class aimed at teaching ESL; but otherwise they take content classes in English with English-speaking students. In Sheltered English, content and ESL instruction are provided in a self-contained classroom; teachers use a simplified

---

[5]BW Associates, "Meeting the Challenge of Language Diversity" 1992.

form of English and modify their teaching techniques to make instruction comprehensible to LEP pupils.

The California study found strengths and weaknesses and advantages and disadvantages in all five approaches. Each of the five programs was implemented in different ways in different schools. The study did not determine that any one model was superior, but instead concluded that "local people should identify those conditions under which one or some combination of approaches are best suited and then adapt the models to match the particular circumstances" (Volume I, page 7). This adaptation to local conditions and the implementation of the program are the key elements of attaining success. The study found that there are three crucial factors or clusters of behaviors that affect the implementation of any of these programs:

1. shared vision and a sensitivity to the LEP students' cultural heritages;
2. suitable staff, ongoing training, and supportive resource allocation; and
3. collaborative coordination and articulation between elementary and secondary schools.

Other major findings included:

1. LEP students' annual rate of mobility or transiency was much higher than other students and could delay academic progress if not adequately dealt with.

2. The costs for the LEP instructional programs were about the same as the costs for mainstream programs. The costs were highest for double immersion and ESL pullout programs. Most funding for LEP instruction came from school district general funds.
3. LEP students in secondary schools have little access to the core curriculum and experience poorly designed and articulated LEP instructional programs.

"The Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Programs,[6]" unlike the longitudinal study, found extensive use of teacher- and student-student interactions that produced active learning environments. This active learning environment is a key component of those special alternative programs which were designated as exemplary. The study identified and described common elements and themes that characterized these sites.

The study looked at special alternative programs which are specially designed programs in which the native language need not be used; some were funded by Title VII and some by other sources. The climate created at schools in which these exemplary programs existed was of great importance; in other words, the on-site situation was crucial to program success. An example was a school in which the entire instructional program for all students was

---

[6]Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory, "The Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Programs-Final Report," 1991.

designed to accommodate the special alternative strand. The entire school's educational personnel participated in in-service education to learn methods to serve the LEP students. This contrasts with the traditional role of pullout English as a Second Language programs in which the students are separated out from the school mainstream, by being pulled out of class for special English instruction; English acquisition is treated as a separate instructional area apart from the core content subjects.

The exemplary special alternative program integrates English acquisition and content learning in an organic way so as to avoid separation and physical removal from the classroom. The program teaches English in context with practical applications, rather than as a distinct discipline. The special alternative program can be successfully used as a supplement to an already-existing transitional bilingual education program. In some schools, it serves as a bridge between the bilingual program and the all-English mainstream. In other words, special alternative can be the transition out of transitional bilingual education. Of crucial importance is the role of the program leader. The creative leadership of this individual, who may be a head teacher, principal, Title VII director, or someone else, is vital to the creating, shaping, nurturing and modifying of the program to ensure that it succeeds and thrives. This role is similar to the active principal's role that is frequently cited in school effectiveness literature.

"The Innovative Approaches Research Project"[7] (IARP) carried out research and development activities in four different topical areas of LEP education--science education, dropout prevention, special education, and community knowledge.

The IARP's science education instructional strategy focused on concrete local conditions. The basis of this strategy was that LEP students can appreciate the value of science through using, absorbing, and testing the scientific method in familiar school and community settings. The project concentrated on nearby environmental issues. Students were encouraged to carry out taste tests of water from different water fountains and to test the water quality of nearby ponds and rivers. The approach was to guide LEP students through the use of the scientific method while examining important parts of the environment that are significant and accessible. The students learn to make hypotheses and to test them; to keep scientific observation journals, to conduct experiments, to reach conclusions, and to test these conclusions in light of the original hypotheses. In so doing, students are often forced to deal with the discrepancy between the non-scientific notions they bring into the classroom, and the scientific explanations that they are exposed to. The creative tension that this discrepancy sets off can be channeled into enhancing the learning process through the use of innovative techniques.

---

[7]Development Associates, "Innovative Approaches Research Project-Final Report," 1991.

The dropout prevention component of the IARP helps educators design plans to maintain or enrich students' academic careers. This program was validated by the United States Department of Education's Program Effectiveness Panel. This project employs at-risk middle school students as tutors for elementary school students. These tutors were encouraged to commit themselves to helping younger students in nearby schools. The tutor/tutee interaction was generally productive. The tutors struggled to improve the learning processes of the elementary school students; the elementary students participated avidly and helped dissuade the tutors from dropping out of school when times got tough. Some elementary school principals initially questioned the program because they did not believe that the tutors could effectively counsel their students. Further they believed that high achieving middle school students should be the tutors, not at-risk students. However, they eventually changed their view as the project progressed. The tutors were paid a small salary. The hourly wage and the non-monetary benefits helped strengthen the tutors' motivation.

The community knowledge component of the IARP draws on assets in the language minority communities. Students increase their literacy and self-esteem through learning to view their community and native language as assets rather than liabilities. The project brings community people to school. These local people explain what they do, which can range from professional jobs to artisan skills to mechanical abilities to homemaking to storytelling. Children are

taken to community sites to view these people in action. Networking and acquiring social skills are emphasized, alongside language and cultural preservation. Literacy skills are enhanced through the keeping of extensive journals, the creating of artistic works, and the involvement in after school laboratories. These laboratories are staffed by specially trained teachers and provide lessons and exercises using community motifs that enrich reading and writing skills in English and in the native language. The students learn because the lessons are made meaningful through the use of a context they can understand and feel comfortable dealing with.

The final component of the IARP is the bilingual Special Education Teacher Assessment Team concept. This concept allows administrators to set up teams of teachers to assess language minority students for special education services. The teachers are specially trained to understand and deal effectively with the instructional needs of LEP students. The teams include bilingual, ESL, and mainstream teachers. Students are thoroughly evaluated, and then are referred to appropriate treatment modalities when appropriate. A major aim is to avoid inappropriate referrals. These inappropriate referrals often result from a referral source that is unfamiliar with the specific needs and characteristics of LEP students. The teacher assessment team is a permanent entity; it reviews progress reports and makes recommendations for mainstreaming when appropriate. This new approach allows schools and school districts to set up internal mechanisms that rely on

trained educators' knowledge and judgment about LEP students' specific needs and the provision of remedies for those needs.

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

A number of studies have examined Title VII programs; some have evaluated these programs, others have described their operations. General information on these programs is available in Chapter IV. The Title VII Special Populations program provides grants to agencies to establish LEP instructional programs of three types: preschool, special education, and gifted and talented education. A study[8] found that some preschool projects use a native language approach, others place equal emphasis on English and the native language and some place the emphasis on English. Some projects enroll only LEP children, while others have both LEP children and native English speakers.

Another study examined the 54 projects that were funded from 1985 to 1989 under the Family English Literacy (FELP) program.[9] California, Texas, and New York had the largest number of FELP projects. Thirty projects were conducted by school districts; 25 percent were operated by universities; and 17 percent were operated by non-profit organizations.

The Family English Literacy program enrolled 20,565 participants. Numbers of participants in projects vary considerably from a low of 40 to a high of 1,278. The average project

---

[8]Pelavin Associates, "A Descriptive Evaluation of the Special Populations Preschool Program," 1991.

[9]Atlantic Resources Corp., "A Descriptive Study of the Title VII Family English Literacy Program," 1991.

serves 395 participants. Sixty-six percent of the participants are Spanish speakers; 9 percent are Hmong speakers, 7 percent are Arabic speakers, and 2 percent are Vietnamese speakers. Participants included: mothers, fathers, other adult family members, and out of school youth.

FELP funded projects devoted about 50 percent of their time to English instruction and conducted the following other activities: native language literacy, parental educational skills instruction; parent/child activities, and pre-employment skills. All projects employed the Whole Language Approach to literacy as their major instructional method, while some employed other methods secondarily. Sixty-five percent of the respondents stated that the project helped them learn or improve their English skills. Twenty-five percent reported that they had been helped in such a way as to better be able to aid their children. Three percent reported they had not been helped much or that they had not been helped at all.

EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL ISSUES

Findings from several major studies on educational personnel issues provide information on OBEMLA's two largest training programs: the educational personnel training program for bachelor's and master's level students and the fellowship program for master's, post-master's and doctoral level students.

The first fellowship study findings covered the 1,720 fellows who participated between 1979 and 1987.[10] The fellowships provided funds for one to three years of advanced graduate study in return

---

[10]Mayatech Corporation, "The Title VII Bilingual Education Fellowship Study Database Analysis Report," 1991.

for either an equal amount of time that fellows would work in the field of bilingual education or a repayment of the fellowship costs.

The compliance rate, meaning those that had either worked an equal amount of time in the field or had repaid their fellowship, was 93 percent. The overall degree completion rate was 52 percent; 46 percent of the fellows at the doctoral level; 72 percent at the post-master's level; and 83 percent at the master's level. The number of students by language group was: Spanish 1367, Chinese 102, other European languages 97, other Asian languages 87, Native American languages 46, and Middle Eastern languages 46. The percentage of fellows found to have been employed in the field was 82 percent, of whom 35 percent were employed at institutions of higher education, 38 percent at local education agencies, and 3 percent at state education agencies. Fifty-nine institutions of higher education (IHEs) participated. New York and California had the largest number of fellows, followed by Texas, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Arizona, Florida, and Massachusetts.

Another 179 fellows entered the program in 1990 and studied at 21 public and 9 private universities according to the second fellowship study.[11] California, Texas, and New York IHEs had the highest number of fellows, followed by Arizona, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Illinois, Connecticut, and Florida. Spanish and Chinese were the most common languages of the fellows,

---

[11]AmerInd, Incorporated, "Report on the Fellows Who Entered the FY 1990 Fellowship Program", 1991.

followed by Hawaiian, Greek, Japanese, Arabic, French and Haitian Creole. The 21 public IHEs enrolled 68 percent of the fellows and received 54 percent of the total program grant funds; the nine private IHEs enrolled 32 percent of the fellows and received 46 percent of the total program funds. The fellows concentrated in certain specialization areas, the most common of which were: special education, literacy, mathematics education, science education, and educational technology.

The Educational Personnel Training program provides grants to institutions of higher education to train students to participate in the delivery of educational services to LEP students. Two studies examined aspects of this program. The first is entitled "A National Study of the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Personnel Training Program."[12] This study focused on program activity since 1985.

The study found that in 1990-1991:

1. Master's level programs were the most prevalent, followed by bachelor's degree programs and certificate/endorsement programs.
2. 63 percent of projects offered bilingual education and English-as-a-second language (ESL) courses of study. About 25 percent offered courses of study in bilingual education only and about 4 percent offered courses in ESL only. About 8

[12]Research Triangle Institute, "A National Study of the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Personnel Training Program-Final Report," 1992.

percent offered courses to train counselors, school psychologists and administrators to work with LEP students.

3. Projects recruited students predominantly from public and private LEAs. About a third of the projects reported difficulty in recruiting students. This was due largely to the notification of grant awards, which came too late to permit recruiting in the project's first year.

4. During academic year 1990-1991, 1,339 students receiving financial support under this program graduated. Of these graduates: 38 percent completed a master's degree, 29 percent obtained a bachelor's degree, and 23 percent completed programs that offered certificates or endorsements.

5. 93 percent of program graduates held positions as educational professionals. 77 percent of program graduates held a position that involved services to LEP students, while the remaining 16 percent held positions that did not involve services to LEPs. About 57 percent of the graduates had positions in bilingual education and 28 percent had positions in ESL.[13]

6. Projects spent an average of 62 percent of grant funds on student aid including stipends, books, travel expenses, tuition, and fees. They spent an average of 25 percent on salaries and benefits for administrators, staff, and faculty. They spent an average of 13 percent on program evaluation,

---

[13]The study states that "These data must be interpreted with extreme caution due to the severe limitations of the graduate sample." (page E-15)

materials and supplies, equipment, faculty travel, and overhead.

The second study[14] concentrated on program activity in 1991, in which there were 4,280 participants at 87 IHEs distributed as follows, by largest concentration:

1. New York
2. Texas
3. California
4. Utah
5. New Mexico
6. Illinois

In fiscal year 1991, 105 Title VII educational personnel training grants were awarded to 87 IHEs, 13 of which received more than one award. Sixty-nine percent of the awards were second or third year continuation grants and 31 percent were new awards. In 1991 the program participants' major areas of specialization were:

1. Special education
2. Early childhood education
3. Mathematics and science
4. Counseling

---

[14]AmerInd, Incorporated, "Specialization Areas for the FY 1991 Title VII Educational Personnel Training Program," 1991.

Important information on the teachers of LEP students was revealed in a study that performed a secondary analysis of the Department's School and Staffing Survey (SASS) of 1987-88. This study looked at teacher issues on a national basis and the secondary analysis uncovered information on bilingual education and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) teachers.[15] The study found that:

1. Approximately three-quarters of bilingual and ESL teachers work in large school districts, those with more than 10,000 students.
2. Most bilingual and ESL teachers are women. Fifty-nine percent of bilingual teachers and 26 percent of ESL teachers are Hispanic.
3. Nearly 90 percent of bilingual teachers teach in the elementary grades, while ESL teachers are evenly divided between elementary and secondary grades.
4. Fifty-eight percent of bilingual teachers have a bachelor's degree only, while 28 percent have a master's degree. ESL teachers are more evenly divided: 39 percent have bachelor's degrees only, while 42 percent have master's degrees.

---

[15]Pelavin Associates, Inc., "A Revised Analysis of the Supply of Bilingual and ESL Teachers," 1991.

CAPACITY BUILDING ISSUES

Title VII classroom instruction grantees are obligated to build local capacity to administer and operate the bilingual education program. For a Title VII application to be funded the Secretary of Education must determine "that the assistance provided under this application will contribute toward building the capacity of the applicant to provide a program on a regular basis similar to that proposed for assistance, which will be of sufficient size, scope and quality to promise significant improvement in the education of children of limited English proficiency, and that the applicant will have the resources and commitment to continue the program when assistance under this title is reduced or no longer available." (Section 7021 (f) (6).)

A recently completed study of capacity building surveyed 497 Title VII LEA instructional projects that were in operation in academic year 1987-1988 and carried out twenty intensive project case studies.[16] The study described and analyzed the capacity building experience reported by the grantees. Findings from the study that the Department needs to further analyze include:

1. Districts absorbed or incorporated aspects of the Title VII funded program into their regular budgets that were supported by local funds.

---

[16]ARC Associates, "A Descriptive Analysis of Bilingual Instructional Service Capacity Building Among Title VII Grantees, 1992."

2. The most commonly retained aspects were the collection and/or purchase of LEP instructional materials, the services of classroom aides or tutors, and the assessment and placement of LEP students.

3. The aspects that were most commonly dropped after the Title VII grant ended included the service of the project director, service of the resource staff, in-service training for program staff, and parent training.

4. Active federal monitoring of grantees to ensure compliance with civil rights laws was an important impetus to capacity building activities.

5. State regulations requiring that LEP students be assessed for language proficiency, provided with appropriate instructional services, and instructed by qualified educational personnel helped stimulate districts to institutionalize these aspects of the program.

6. The establishment of a bilingual education/English as a Second Language office in a district provided the infrastructure to develop and administer LEP instructional programs.

7. Communicating and collaborating with LEA administrators and staff, school boards, parents, and community members and informing them about the needs of and programs for LEP students can also help capacity building.

8. The recruitment and retention of qualified Title VII project staff and shared decision making about major issues were also important factors in capacity building.

The study concluded that Title VII funding can be expected to result in institutionalization and therefore recommended that Title VII should continue to provide grants to local districts for LEP instructional projects. The study also recommended: that state departments of education should play an active role in helping LEAs build capacity; that Title VII staff solicit the support of superintendents, school board members, and principals; and that LEAs ensure that high quality Title VII staff are hired and retained.

CHAPTER IV

OBEMLA BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT ACTIVITIES

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) is authorized to administer Title VII programs under the Bilingual Education Act. These programs will be described in this chapter as they were undertaken in Fiscal Year 1991. The Act authorizes the programs by function and subsumes them under Parts A, B, and C. Under Part A, grants provide assistance to school districts and other educational agencies for classroom instructional projects. Under Part B, grants and contracts are authorized for collecting and analyzing data, research activities, and evaluating Title VII programs. Under Part C, grants and contracts are authorized for preservice and in-service training for educational personnel, fellowships, other training activities, and technical assistance. The programs will be described under each part of the Bilingual Education Act, using data from OBEMLA program files.

PROGRAMS UNDER PART A-FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

Part A programs are designed to provide financial assistance in the form of competitive grants to school districts and other

educational agencies to enable LEP students to achieve English competence and to meet grade promotion and graduation requirements. Descriptive information and analyses of some of these programs can be found in Chapter 3. The Bilingual Education Act sets aside a minimum of 60 percent of its funds for Part A. Six programs are authorized under Part A:

1. Transitional Bilingual Education Program

2. Special Alternative Instructional Program

3. Developmental Bilingual Education Program

4. Academic Excellence Program

5. Family English Literacy Program

6. Special Populations Program

Transitional bilingual education programs make use of the LEP students' native language and English to provide an instructional program to achieve English competence, as well as grade promotion and graduation requirements. Discretionary grants are provided to local educational agencies (LEAs) for three years, with renewals of up to two more years. In Fiscal Year 1991, there were 488

projects, with a total funding of $75,000,000. The number of students served was approximately 216,202.

Special alternative instructional programs are specially designed programs of structured English language instruction and special instructional services that promote English language competence, grade promotion, and meeting graduation standards. Native language instruction in the students' native languages is not required. Discretionary grants are provided to LEAs for three years with renewals of up to two more years. In Fiscal Year 1991 201 projects were funded under this program for a total of $21,697,300. Approximately 29,234 students were served in this fiscal year.

Developmental bilingual education programs are full-time programs of structured English-language instruction and instruction in a non-English language to help LEP students achieve competence in English and a second language while mastering subject matter skills and meeting grade promotion and graduation requirements. Where possible, classes must be composed of approximately equal numbers of native English language students and LEP students whose native language is the second language of instruction. Discretionary grants are provided to LEAs for three years, with renewals of up to two more years. In Fiscal Year 1991, 24 projects were funded under this program for a total of approximately $3,800,000. Approximately 2,900 students were served in this fiscal year.

There were also special competitions in which LEAs submitted applications for the three programs described above--transitional bilingual education, special alternative instruction, and developmental bilingual education. The Department of Education established priorities for LEP students who were recent arrivals and programs in magnet middle schools.

Thirteen transitional bilingual education grants and 11 special alternative instructional grants were awarded specifically to serve recent arrivals, LEP students who had entered an LEA within the last two years. The grant funds were $3,800,000. LEAs are eligible for these grants if they had a recent major influx of LEP students within the last two years. A recent major influx means the arrival in the LEA within the last two years of at least 500 LEP students or a number of LEP students that equals at least 3 percent of the LEA's total enrollment.

Magnet middle school grants were awarded to two special alternative instructional and two developmental bilingual education programs. The total grant funds was $745,000. These grants are to serve LEP students grades 6 through 9 in already existing magnet schools. The grants are designed to foster academic achievement and dropout prevention. A project must involve an instructional approach that emphasizes one or more of the following curriculum areas: mathematics, science, English, history, geography, or other areas of the arts and humanities. The project must incorporate an evaluation plan designed to measure the project's effectiveness in increasing academic achievement and student retention.

Academic excellence programs disseminate the instructional practices of transitional and developmental bilingual education and special alternative instructional programs that have an established record of providing effective and academically excellent instruction and that are designed to serve as models of exemplary programs. Projects must include exemplary programs that are nominated by the state education agency or validated by the Department's Program Effectiveness Panel. Projects provide information, in-service training and technical assistance to persons or organizations that are interested in adopting the model programs. Discretionary grants are provided to LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs) and private nonprofit organizations for three years. In Fiscal Year 1991, 17 projects were funded under this program for a total of $3,243,920.

The Family English Literacy Program provides an instructional program of English acquisition and proficiency to LEP adults and out-of-school youth. The programs are also designed to facilitate parent participation in their children's education and to provide the educational requirements for persons who are eligible for temporary resident status under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. Special emphasis is placed on providing instruction to parents and family members of LEP students in Title VII programs. Instruction may be conducted only in English or in English and the native language of the participants. Discretionary grants are provided to LEAs, IHEs, and private nonprofit organizations for three years. In Fiscal Year 1991, 39 projects

were funded under this program for a total of $5,287,765. Approximately 5,295 students were served in this fiscal year.

The Special Populations Program serves LEP students in preschool, special education, and gifted and talented programs that are preparatory or supplementary to programs such as those assisted under the Bilingual Education Act. Discretionary grants are provided for three years to LEAs, IHEs, and nonprofit organizations. In Fiscal Year 1991, 45 projects were funded under this program for a total of $6,688,624. Approximately 14,981 students were served in this Fiscal Year.

PROGRAMS UNDER PART B-DATA COLLECTION, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH

Part B programs provide grants and contracts to fund the following activities:

1. research;

2. evaluation;

3. data collection, aggregation and analysis;

4. state education agency grant program;

5. Evaluation Assistance Centers; and

6. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

The Research and Evaluation program is responsible for the first three activities outlined above, namely: research, evaluation, and the collection, aggregation and analysis of data. This program is designed to strengthen instructional programs for LEP students. A full description of OBEMLA's Research and Evaluation program activities is provided in the first section of Chapter 3. In Fiscal Year 1991 contracts were awarded to individuals and organizations to carry out these activities. These contracts totaled $2.6 million.

The state education agency grant program provides monies to SEAs to collect, aggregate, analyze, and publish data on the State's LEP population and the educational services that were provided to that population. SEA grants may also be used for:

1. planning and developing educational programs;

2. reviewing and evaluating programs of bilingual education;

3. providing coordination or supervision of technical assistance to LEAs, community organizations and private schools serving LEP students;

4. developing and administering instruments and procedures for assessing LEP students' educational needs;

5. training state and local education agency staff; and

6. developing and coordinating other activities to build the capacity of SEAs and LEPs to serve LEP students.

In Fiscal Year 1991, 53 grants were awarded to SEAs under this program for total funding of approximately $6,500,000.

The Evaluation Assistance Centers are designed to aid SEAs and LEAS in identifying and evaluating the education needs and competencies of participants in their bilingual education programs and assessing the education progress of these participants. In Fiscal Year 1991, there were two EACs (East and West) which served the entire country. In this year, a total of approximately $1,200,000 was awarded for the two centers.

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education is designed to collect, analyze, and disseminate information about bilingual education and related programs. It provides assistance to educators, parents, legislators, and others on the delivery of instructional services to LEP students. The clearinghouse was funded at $1,100,000 for Fiscal Year 1991.

PROGRAMS UNDER PART C-EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TRAINING PROGRAM

OBEMLA provides funds for training programs and training and technical assistance centers to serve education personnel and trainers who are working with or preparing to work with LEP

students. Descriptive information and analyses of the operations of some of these programs is provided in Chapter 3. These programs and centers are:

1. Education Personnel Training programs;

2. Short-Term Training programs;

3. Training Development and Improvement programs;

4. Fellowship programs; and

5. Multifunctional Resource Centers.

The Education Personnel Training Program provides three-year discretionary grants to IHEs to train teachers and other education personnel to work with LEP students. Most of the participants in this program are preservice or in-service teachers preparing to meet certification requirements. Other participants include counselors, administrators, parents, and paraprofessionals. In Fiscal Year 1991, 105 grants were awarded, totaling $17,445,454. This program served 4,389 participants.

The Short-Term Training Program is designed to improve the skills of parents and educational personnel who are involved in LEP instructional programs. Grants are provided for one to three

years. In Fiscal Year 1991, 34 grants were awarded, totaling $3,733,337. The program served 4,475 participants.

The Training Development and Improvement Program supports the development of IHE training programs that serve LEP instructional needs. Activities may involve developing or revising training curricula, training faculty, or recruiting faculty with expertise in the delivery of instructional services to LEP students. Grants are provided for three years. In Fiscal Year 1991, four grants were awarded, totaling $368,347.

The Fellowship Program awards fellowships to full-time graduate students pursuing degrees in areas related to programs for LEP students. These areas include teacher training, program administration, research and evaluation, and curriculum development. IHEs are approved for participation in this program by the Department. OBEMLA determines the number of fellowships to be awarded at each IHE on an annual basis. In Fiscal Year 1991, 39 IHEs participated, 316 fellowships were awarded for a total of $3,635,927.

The Multifunctional Resource Centers (MRCs) provide technical assistance and training services to persons participating in or preparing to participate in programs of LEP instruction. These centers also gather and disseminate information on a specific area of bilingual education. The Bilingual Education Act provides for at least 16 MRCs to serve the entire nation. In Fiscal Year 1991, 16 contracted centers were awarded for a total of $10.8 million.

CHAPTER V

CRITICAL CHALLENGES FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Even a cursory review of the final chapter of the June 30, 1991, report The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation confirms that the vast majority of its statements retain their currency. The LEP student population is still rising rapidly, and the need for bilingual education programs, consequently, continues to increase. It is still true that research is vital to the development of curricula and instructional methodology that effectively matches the educational characteristics of these students. Last year OBEMLA reported its involvement in identifying the salient issues for the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act. The Office has now progressed to examining those issues and devising alternative approaches to them. OBEMLA's determination to integrate educational services to LEP students into the wide range of initiatives elicited by the national education goals and AMERICA 2000 has intensified.

One statement in the last report has been made obsolete by the passage of a year: "While relevant 1990 census data are not yet available . . . ." In the interval some of those data became available. They confirmed what other sources had suggested: immigration grew massively in the past decade and with it the population of students who lack the English language competence to

succeed academically in American schools. According to the Census, 8 million new immigrants entered the country in the 1980s, the second highest level since the peak of 8.8 million reached during the wave of immigration early in the century. A handful of states have been the primary recipients of LEP populations; California, for example, sometimes referred to as "the new Ellis Island," is estimated to have a LEP school-age population of 1 million. New York, Texas, Florida, and Illinois have also been heavily impacted by newcomers. No region of the country, however, has been exempted from the influx. And, hence, every region finds itself catapulted, sometimes literally overnight, into transforming its educational services expeditiously to meet the demands of student bodies increasingly diverse in culture and language.

OBEMLA believes that the federal government continues to play a valid and valuable role in facilitating the response of local communities to their new student bodies. Federal grants are intended to build the capacity of local educational agencies to operate programs, but are not intended to provide long-term assistance. By funding projects that allow school districts to design and institutionalize resources, training state education officers and bilingual directors, aggregating and disseminating accurate data, and pushing the research questions, OBEMLA is enhancing the capacity of communities to educate all their children. The partnership between the Administration and Congress remains a cornerstone of the nation's efforts to assist LEP students to gain access to American education processes.

Program Priorities

The fact is that American student bodies have been -- and still are -- undergoing a major redefinition. Some 2 million plus LEP students, or 5 percent, out of a public school population of roughly 40 million, are language minorities categorized as "limited English proficient" according to criteria laid down by the states. By definition, these students lack the requisite competence in academic English to pursue education in the mainstream American classroom. Add to these language minority students who, though not defined as "limited English proficient," have not yet attained the linguistic competence required to sustain academic success. Add still further students whose level of competence in English permits them full access to educational opportunities and who, simultaneously, are at home in other languages and cultures. A significant portion of students, then, arrive in American schools with skills and needs that demand new competencies of teachers. Perhaps the most critical question facing us, then, is how to utilize existing resources and create new ones to respond to the changed school population. Title VII monies reach approximately 11 percent of the LEP students in American schools. State and local monies account for the preponderance of services. The nation simply does not possess the personnel resources necessary to undertake the first rate education of these students. And the long-term consequences of not providing an adequate education reverberate in every area of American life.

Faced with the challenge of generating resources for a changing student population, OBEMLA has elected to turn the spotlight on institutions of higher education (IHEs). It seems to us that a productive approach is to maximize the capacity of IHEs to prepare teachers with the competencies and the understandings to educate the new student populations. In other words, it seems to us a sensible course to expend available resources and knowhow to redirect current teacher preparation programs. In particular, OBEMLA believes it would be productive to focus on the trainers of teachers, the faculty of education departments in colleges and universities.

To this end, OBEMLA undertook two new initiatives this year.

1. We conducted an invitational roundtable for deans of schools of education. Sixty participated. In a three-hour session on the changes that must occur in curricula as well as practice in teacher education programs, the deans heard Dean Catherine Snow, Harvard School of Education, and discussed critical issues. OBEMLA's position is that current conditions require not the recruitment of additional positions for education faculties but rather the development of new skills by faculty already on board.

2. OBEMLA conducted a new competition under the Training, Development, and Improvement (TDI) program. Three projects at three universities have been awarded grants to implement programs with the sole purpose of retraining higher education faculty so that they can, in turn, educate new and continuing

elementary and secondary teachers to work with multicultural, multilingual, limited English proficient students. OBEMLA sees this venture as a means of maximizing limited federal dollars by investing in those already in education departments.

Similarly, OBEMLA believes that Title VII projects across the nation should give high priority to staff development strategies for the continuing education of mainstream teachers in elementary and secondary schools. American schools already house many excellent, experienced teachers, highly skilled in subject matter content, child and adolescent development, and instructional methods. It is increasingly likely that the vast majority of American teachers will, at some point in their teaching careers, have in their fifth grade and American history and carpentry classes students of limited English proficiency and, certainly, of divergent cultural and linguistic backgrounds. With some additional training, the educational competence of these teachers can become, to these students, the valuable resource it has long been to the more "traditional" student. Such mainstream teachers need to add to their already considerable competence a knowledge of the theory and methodologies of second language acquisition, techniques for guiding English language development by means of core curriculum content (history, science, and so forth), and multilingual/multicultural sensitivity. This field, too, offers a productive avenue for multiplying the educational personnel required for the education of the continuing waves of new learners

in American schools. OBEMLA believes the nation possesses a largely untapped potential in the direct collaboration between local educational agencies and IHEs. Together these agencies could bring their considerable expertise to bear on the design and implementation of preservice and in-service training strategies.

Reauthorization

Through its participation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Task Force appointed by Deputy Secretary David Kearns, OBEMLA has joined forces with other Department units in identifying and examining the major statutory issues which the experience of twenty plus years has identified. As the field of bilingual education becomes more clearly defined, as the body of research grows, as government agencies at all levels acquire greater technical and theoretical knowhow, it is inevitable that new questions will surface. Both success and failure make it easier to recognize inconsistencies in definition and the overlapping in reality of programs that look wholly discrete on paper. Experience also generates awareness of new possibilities. Reauthorization offers, therefore, the opportunity not only to correct what doesn't work but to invent additional alternatives.

To pinpoint the priority issues, OBEMLA has (1) held its own staff discussions to capitalize on the broad background of its members and (2) held two sessions to allow Title VII project directors to voice their concerns and recommendations. The Office sent a senior staff member to each of the six national hearings.

The posture of the Office during the preliminary phase of reauthorization work stressed listening to the field. Some of the earliest issues raised were the name "limited English proficient," the time limits placed on program grants as well as on the participation of English speaking students in Title VII programs, the training of educational personnel to meet the needs of students, and the most appropriate forms of parental involvement and training. Increasingly the six national education goals functioned as a framework for defining issues and norms for assessing options.

The reauthorization process has offered a valuable context for OBEMLA to increase its knowledge of current statutory and regulatory provisions, to gain deeper insights into the experience of practitioners, and to raise questions that will lead, if not now then at a later point in the future, to the continuing renewal of the field.

The National Education Goals

Like other units within the Department of Education, OBEMLA has been involved in the full range of activities to understand the national goals and to plan their realization. In particular, OBEMLA has consistently explored the mutual implications of the national goals and of Title VII objectives for one another. In formulating budgets for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, OBEMLA took explicit steps to integrate the national goals and the sixteen programs administered by the Office. For example, OBEMLA

established an invitational priority for transitional and special alternative projects using math and science to teach English. Similarly the Office encouraged local districts to submit proposals for programs emphasizing preschool readiness. The Office inventoried current projects to identify initiatives giving special attention to raising high school completion rates. The National Clearinghouse prepared and disseminated brochures on each goal; a brochure explains the goal and lists pertinent NCBE publications. The Director has addressed many audiences on the linkages between the national goals and bilingual education.

In the last Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, we noted OBEMLA's determination that language minority students and their families be incorporated into activities at all levels to actualize the national education goals. In particular we voiced the urgency of including these peoples and their gifts in the AMERICA 2000 initiatives of local communities. As the concrete experience of the Department and the nation with the goals grows, so will our understanding of their meaning. Options will proliferate, and both government agencies and communities will become more adept at constructing strategies. OBEMLA believes that a generation of American schools that is truly new will have discovered how to integrate the diverse populations now defined as "different" (by implication, "deficient") into one process of learning. At that stage, LEP students will not be perceived as transients waiting in a vestibule until they know enough English to enter "real" classes. Rather, time spent in bilingual education

classes will be quality learning time during which the students' knowledge of language, content, concept, and high order thinking will advance one another. OBEMLA wants reauthorization debates, national goal implementation, and AMERICA 2000 initiatives to be the contexts within which this future takes shape. Through nearly a quarter of a century of federal involvement in and contribution to bilingual education, we have amassed considerable practice and theory. OBEMLA is determined to tap that resource purposefully in addressing the educational needs not only of limited English proficient students but of a whole society.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1992-330-123/70156